

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERAppl. No. 09/378,208
Amendment & Response to Final Office Action dated 05-31-06

AUG 30 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5, 8-18, 21-32, 35-46, 49-56 and 59-80 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, 27, 41 and 55 are independent claims. Claims 1, 14, 27, 41 and 55 are currently amended. Claims 6, 7, 13, 19, 20, 26, 33, 34, 40, 47, 48, 54, 57, 58 and 81 were cancelled without prejudice.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-5, 8-18, 21-32, 35-46, 49-56, 59, 61-62, 64-65, 67-68, 70-71 and 73-80 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik et al. USPN: 6,023,701 (hereinafter: Malik), in view of Schmid (Web Representation with Dynamic Thumbnails) (hereinafter: Schmid) and Brown et al. USPN: 6,278,448 (hereinafter: Brown). (Final Office Action, Page 2). Claims 60, 63, 66, 69 and 72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik, in view of Schmid and Brown and further in view of Gennaro et al. USPN: 5,742,768 (hereinafter: Gennaro). (Final Office Action, Page 6). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." (emphasis added) (MPEP § 2143). "If an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious." (emphasis added) *In re Fine*, 837 F. 2d 1071, 5USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 14, 27, 41 and 55 include elements that do not appear to have been disclosed by any of the references cited by the Patent Office, either alone or in combination.

Appl. No. 09/378,208
Amendment & Response to Final Office Action dated 05-31-06

Independent Claims 1, 14, 27, 41 and 55 of the present invention each generally recite:

"generating a user-customizable representation of said linked second site, the representation being a graphical image indicative of content of said linked second site; correlating, as directed by a user, a user-customizable keyword with the representation"

The above-referenced claimed elements of the present invention allow for personalized previewing of content of the linked second site. (Present Application, Page 7, Lines 24-26). For example, a keyword, such as baseball, which may be included with descriptive information describing the content of the linked second site, may be correlated with a representation/graphical image of a baseball, to promote ease of searching when attempting to locate a desired linked site. (Present Application, Page 7, Lines 11-15). Further, the keyword and representation may be customized by the user, and correlated, as directed by the user, to allow for personalized previewing of the content of the second linked site. (Present Application, Page 7, Lines 24-26). None of the cited references, either alone or in combination teach or suggest the above-referenced elements.

Based on the rationale above, Applicant contends that none of the references cited by the Patent Office against the present invention, either alone or in combination, appear to disclose the above-referenced elements as claimed in Claims 1, 14, 27, 41 and 55 of the present application and therefore, the above-cited references do not preclude patentability of the present invention under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant further contends that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to combine or modify any of the above-cited references, either alone or in combination, to arrive at the present invention as claimed. As a result, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for independent Claims 1, 14, 27, 41 and 55. Thus, independent Claims 1, 14, 27, 41 and 55 are believed allowable. Further, Claims 2-5, 8-12, 60-62, 75 and 80 (which depend from claim 1), Claims 15-18, 21-25, 63-65 and 76 (which depend from claim 14), Claims 28-32, 35-39, 66-68 and 77 (which depend from claim 27), Claims 42-46, 49-53, 69-71 and

Appl. No. 09/378,208
Amendment & Response to Final Office Action dated 05-31-06


78 (which depend from claim 41) and Claims 56, 59, 72-74 and 79 (which depend from claim 55) are therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

In light of the forgoing, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

GATEWAY, INC.

By 
Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. 24,333
Gateway, Inc.
610 Gateway Dr., Y-04
N. Sioux City, SD 57049
Telephone (605) 232-1967
Fax (605) 232-2612

Date: August 30, 2006